

## REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1, 7, 9 and 15 are amended; and claim 14 is canceled. Claims 1-7, 9, 12 and 15-18 are pending. Claim 1 is amended as discussed below; claims 7, 9 and 15 are amended to correct typographical errors and to improve expression of antecedent basis. Support for the amended claims can be found in the specification as filed, for example in the original claims and in the specification, for example at page 8 and page 10, second paragraph.

Pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action indicate that all pending rejections were withdrawn. Three new rejections appear on pages 3-7.

In view of the amendment and associated Remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of all outstanding rejections are deemed proper.

### Rejections under 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 1-7, 9, 12 and 14-16 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) over Seemann in view of Anderson and in further view of Ponpipom.

Claim 1 is amended to obviate this rejection. The applied references do not individually or combined do not teach or suggest a compound as claimed having "the carbohydrate complement comprises an exposed terminal carbohydrate mannose residue and at least one exposed terminal carbohydrate residue selected from the group consisting of galactose, N-acetylglucosamine, N-acetylactose, glucose and fucose."

Claim 1 is also amended to incorporate subject matter previously recited in claim 14. Claim 14 is canceled. No *prima facie* case of obviousness appears to have been established with respect to claim 14. Moreover the specification, for example in the paragraph bridging pages 18 and 19 discusses unexpected results obtained using a "FUP that has been expressed in CHO cells." For at least this reason the subject matter of claim 1 cannot properly be deemed to be obvious over the applied references. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 2-7, 9, 12 and 15-16 ultimately depend from claim 1 and therefore are patentable over prior art for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Claim 17 was rejected under 35 USC §103(a) over Seemann in view of Anderson and Ponpipom and in further view of Bosslet and Jahde.


Claim 18 was rejected under 35 USC §103(a) over Seemann in view of Anderson and Ponpipom and in further view of Bagshaw.

The references applied in these two rejections of claims 17 and 18 are not alleged to teach or suggest the subject matter claimed in amended claim 1. Moreover, claim 1 as amended is also unobvious because of the showing of unexpected results. Accordingly, since these claims ultimately depend from claim 1 they are patentable over prior art for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

#### Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of all pending rejections. Applicants respectfully submit that the application is now in condition for allowance and request prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
George S. Jones, Reg. No. 38,508  
Attorney for Applicant

sanofi-aventis US Inc.  
Patent Department  
Route #202-206 / P.O. Box 6800  
Bridgewater, NJ 08807-0800  
Telephone (908) 231-3776  
Telefax (908) 231-2626

Docket No. DEAV1993/B005 US CNT2